The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, October 29, 1940

Text of President Roosevelt's New York Campaign

By John Q. Adams

The President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, today, October 29, 1940, spoke at the New York Convention of the Democratic Party. His speech was widely reported in the press.

Roosevelt said that the nation faced a crisis of unprecedented magnitude, and that the choice before the American people was clear: to support the Democratic program, which he described as a program of peace, prosperity, and democracy.

He criticized the Republican Party for its policies in the past, and called for a new direction for the country.

The speech was well-received by the audience, and was widely regarded as a turning point in the campaign.
October 27, 1940

Dear Mr. Hopkins:

I do not wish to appear presumptuous, but there are a few lines I feel sure would stop the show if the President based them, as well as arrive home the point. Even at this late date, therefore, I wish you would consider the possibility of using them. They are marked on the attached copy of my draft, as follows:

Page 9. Quotation from Senator Bridges, and comment on the "snatching who wagged his tail while burglars helped themselves to the family silver."

Page 11. Quotation from Mr. Fish, that "we might as well endorse President Roosevelt and elect him."

Page 13. Quotation from Senator Taft, that we can meet any German blitzkrieg, "if there is to be such a blitzkrieg," "at the time we find out what it is."

This quotation perfectly characterizes Republican tinicity and shortsightedness. The humor that the President can put into these lines cannot be matched, and he can drive home to millions of hearers the conviction that this is truly the "stuff of which appeasement is made." Without it, the charge does not have any greater force than it did as it came from Secretary Wallace.

In this connection, please note that even Ernest Lindley, only this morning, characterized the appeasement charge as simply "cliches. Millions believe this to be true who can be persuaded, I am positive, by the reading of this passage. It is worth tons of argument. If you cannot do anything else, please, please, use this one. If you cannot use it, the charge of appeasement ought to be dropped. It is a haymaker swing; if it lands, it's a knockout; if it misses, it looks awfully foolish.

Page 16. The cry of an Irish that instinctively went up when the pocketbook nerve was touched by the "draft industry" amendment.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]
GILBERT DRAFT NO. 2 FOR SPEECH ON OCTOBER 28, 1940

I have been criticized, since last Wednesday night, for debating the issues of 1932 and for neglecting the issues of 1940. Well, who was it that made the proposition that we are still flat on our back—as in 1932? Who is it who has been charging that our industry is demoralized—as in 1932, and that we have failed to make any progress these last 8 years—since 1932?

They asked for the comparison and I tried to oblige. They don’t seem to like to be reminded. They dare me to discuss more recent issues, the more recent record. They dare me to discuss the issues of 1940. Very well, since they ask for it, I propose tonight to let them have it.

I propose hardly to mention the record of 1929-32. I propose to examine the record of 1936, 1939, and 1940, the record of the two parties on defense and foreign policy during these last three years. I don’t think they are going to like what I have to say tonight a bit better than they liked my discussion of the record last Wednesday.

When this administration came into office in 1933 (I can’t help mentioning that year; after all, that was where we started, you know) the country was flat on its back; and so were our armed forces. This is universally conceded today, just as it was universally understood then.

I wonder whether anyone will have the gall to challenge this statement. We took prompt and vigorous measures to rebuild our Navy and our forces on land and in the air.
As you well remember, I early saw the storm that was gathering in Europe and in Asia. Year by year I reported to the Congress and to the Nation the warnings of danger received from all our listening posts in foreign lands. Year by year I asked for more and ever more defense. Year by year the Congress voted that defense. Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength. Our Army and our air forces are at the highest level they have ever been in peacetime.

Permit me to read a few quotations concerning the state of our defenses. I quote:

"The facts are that we have the largest and most powerful Navy we ever had, except for two years after the World War, and the greatest air force we ever had, and a match for any nation."

Now the man who made that statement is not I. He is not even a member of this administration. He is the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, Representative Hamilton Fish.

He made that statement in June 1938, and he has repeated that same opinion again and again right down to the very opening of this campaign.

Mr. Hoover, of course, is of the vintage of 1932. Let us turn to a Republican leader of more recent vintage. Let us call on Mr. Landon, vintage 1936, to the stand. In May 1939, he said (and I quote):

"There is no question in my mind that the command of the sea insures security in our land for my time and probably for my youngest child's time."
Is he the lone Republican holding such views? Hardly.

Let me read you a statement by Senator Vandenberg. In April 1936, he said that our defense expenditures had bought us (and I quote) "an incomparably efficient Navy." Note these words of the Senator; they are clear and explicit: "an incomparably efficient Navy."

That was in 1936, before there was any thought of this election.

In January of the same year, hear what Mr. Hoover had to say:

"We shall be spending 200 million dollars more than any nation on earth," he said. "We are loading in the arms race."

It is difficult for me to construe this as a charge of neglect.

But, then, I am no Republican! I don't have the necessary agility.
There seemed to be no doubt in Mr. Landon's mind a year and a half ago that our Navy was adequate to meet any challenge to our security. And six months later, after the outbreak of the war in Europe, he was even more firmly convinced of the adequacy of the defenses we had built. He said (and again I quote):

"We are in better position to defend ourselves against a foreign foe than we have ever been in the past."

Of course, Mr. Landon sings a different tune today. I mentioned that tune last Wednesday.

And now let us call upon a Republican leader of very recent vintage, vintage 1920, Senator Taft. One year ago, in October 1939, after the outbreak of the war, the Senator said (I quote):

"I am convinced we can defend this continent against any combination likely to develop in the rest of the world."

And in February 1940, four months later, Senator Taft went that statement one better. I quote again:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense."

Of course we were then getting closer to election, and closer to the conventions, but even the best of Republicans sometimes slip up and speak their true minds.

I could go on with such statements for the rest of the night. But let me call on just one more Republican Leader. Let me call on Senator Lodge for his views on the condition of our defenses. In October 1939, he declared himself in these words (and I quote):
"No European power can occupy or vanquish the United States, and it is fanciful to suggest that it could. Fortunately our national safety is not at stake."

Here is the record; here is the crystal clear record. Until the present campaign opened, until there was a partisan advantage to be gained by the charge of unpreparedness, every Republican leader, in Congress and out, shouted from the housetops that our defenses were fully adequate and that further strengthening of our armed forces could be intended only (and I quote) "for aggression and to police and quarantine the world."

But today (I wonder if the election could have something to do with it) today they parade up and down the country, painting a black picture, a dismal picture. Today they croak that this administration has starved our armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, our Army puny, our air forces pitifully weak.

Let me make a perfectly simple proposition. If the Republicans were telling the truth about our defenses in 1938 and '39, then they stand convicted—convicted out of their own mouths—of falsehood today. And if they are telling the truth today, then they stand convicted—again out of their own mouths—of having lied in 1938 and '39. The simple truth is that the Republican Party played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. They are playing politics with our defense today.

How did the Republican leaders come to make these statements in 1938 and 1939? What was the occasion for these vehemence declarations...
that our defenses were fully adequate to any and all emergencies? The answer must be painfully embarrassing to the Republicans today, for in the answer lies their record of obstruction, their record of sabotage of this administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger upon the horizon.

The occasion for these statements was in each case some proposal of this administration to increase the Navy, the Army, or the air forces. When there was a concrete opportunity to vote for additional defense, the leaders of the Republican Party, without exception, took that occasion to declare that our defenses were entirely adequate.

Of course, they endorsed defense, in principle. But defense, like other good things, costs money; and at that they boggle — they always do. They are always for the measure we propose, but "don't let's spend any money!" And so they declared that our defenses were strong enough and needed no further strengthening. And so, when I asked for more and ever more defense, they charged that I was an alarmist, an interventionist, a warmonger. And so — and this is the rub of the matter — they voted against the additional appropriations I requested.

Early in 1938 the Naval Expansion Bill was up for discussion. This bill provided for a 20 per cent expansion in our Navy. It called for 46 new fighting ships, including 3 battleships and 2 aircraft carriers, for 26 auxiliary vessels, and for 950 new airplanes. What was the Republican record on this bill?

First, the Republicans attempted to eliminate the battleships. In the vote on the battleships, the Democrats in the House voted
252 to 35 in favor of building them. The Republicans in the House voted 67 to 20 against building them. In the Senate the Democrats voted 52 to 9 for the battleships, while the Republicans voted 7 to 4 against, with 5 Republicans not voting at all. Clearly, in 1936 the Republicans were sure we needed no more battleships.

In the final vote on this important defense measure in the House of Representatives, the Democrats voted 263 to 31 for the increase in the Navy; the Republicans voted 57 to 30 against that increase. In the Senate, the Democrats voted 49 to 17 for it; and the Republicans split, 7 to 7, with 2 Republicans not voting at all.

Now this is just a sample. I could go on to give you vote after vote. In every case the Republican leaders, with their eyes on the cash register, loudly protested that our defenses were adequate, that further expansion could be designed only for aggression.

Let us call the roll of those who today belittle their own words in charging that we are defenseless. On that roll you will find them all: Hoover, Landon, McNary, Kellogg, Vandenberg, Taft, Wheeler, Fish.

I deeply regret that we did not do more for defense. The Nation deeply regrets it. But this is a democracy, and these decisions are not made by the President alone, but by the Congress and fundamentally by the people, whose will it is the function of democratic government to translate into policy. This country, until May of this year, was strongly isolationist. Many labored under the illusion that, flanked by mighty oceans, we were remote from the perils of Europe and Asia, that we were secure.
In September (1) 1937, I warned of the march of aggression.
I warned of the approaching catastrophe. I urged that aggression,
like a deadly plague, knows no limits, respects no boundaries. I
proposed that aggression be quarantined before it could gather
momentum. You all remember the reception that warning got.

Those who disagreed with me were sincere and patriotic
Americans. I do not for a moment charge otherwise. But those who
disagreed with me were mistaken, as I think we all realize today. In
all fairness and honesty, should they not concede their error?

But what shall we say of the honesty, the sincerity, of the
leaders of the Republican Party who in 1938 and 1939 opposed defense
by word and by deed and who today charge that this administration has
been shortsighted, that this administration has neglected our defense?
Where would our defenses be today if they had been in office these
past 8 years? On their record you can judge for yourselves.

But the record on defense appropriations is only the begin-
ning of the story. Just in case there is some lingering doubt in your
minds, let us turn to three other basic issues of defense and foreign
policy, issues which have been debated and decided in the past year.
Here we shall find the same vision, the same boldness, indeed all the
sterling qualities of Republican leadership.

The first of the issues I propose to discuss is our neutrality
legislation. In September of last year, promptly on the war's outbreak,
I called the Congress into special session to revise the Neutrality
Act in order to permit the shipment of arms and materials of war to the
Allies on a cash-and-carry basis. Without such revision, this Nation
was prevented by law from sending arms and war materials to any bellig-
ernent, to the victims of aggression as to the aggressors.

This measure stands as a landmark in our foreign policy.
Without it, Britain could have received no aid from us and might today
be a defeated nation, a vassal of dictatorship. Without it, only the
ocean might today stand between us and the forces of world conquest.
Some Republicans today declare their endorsement of our aid to Britain.
But Republicans less than one year ago voted overwhelmingly to defeat
the measure without which that aid would today be impossible.

The vote on the Neutrality Act of 1939 was as follows (this
will be uncomfortable listening for some of my hearers): In the
Senate, the Democrats voted 54 to 12 for the act to make aid to Britain
possible. The Republicans voted 15 to 8 against aid to Britain. In
the House, the contrast was even more striking. The Democrats voted
222 to 29 for aid to Britain, and the Republicans voted 140 to 20
against such aid. Among the Republicans voting against the act were
McNary, Martin, Lodge, Taft, Vandenberg, Barton, Fish, Johnson.

Let us tune in on the views of Republican leaders on the
neutrality issue. Let us tune in on some of the choice items. First,
let us hear from Mr. Landon. He speaks, and I quote:

"Henceforth we must not allow friendship or animosity to
influence our foreign policy."

Here is true wisdom. Consider these words well. Here—true
true—true wisdom. Whether they are friend or enemy, whether they are peace-
loving or warlike, whether they threaten us or not—Mr. Landon advises
us we must not "allow friendship or unisonity to influence our foreign policy."

Next, we hear doxiey Senator Taft:

"I do not claim that a world dominated by Hitler and Stalin would be a pleasant place to live in. But terrible as conditions might be, I do not see how they would threaten the safety of the United States."

The Senator did not see how the dictatorships, dictatorships dominating all the rest of the world, "how they would threaten the safety of the United States." There is vision, indeed.

Senator Bridges, however, hedged a bit—a very little bit. He looked far, far into the futures:

"There may come a time," he said, "when the United States must take a very decided position in the foreign quarrels now under way, but I don't believe that time is here yet. Meanwhile we should actually practice a good neighbor policy by being friendly to all."

"Friendly to all" — we have all heard of the watchdog who wagged his tail while the burglars helped themselves to the family silver.

These were the views of the Republicans of one year ago. But today some of them profess a change of mind. Not all, however. Mr. Landon, for example, on the first day of this month, gave it as his view that we had already gone too far in aid to the two democracies
who are keeping the dictatorships fully engaged thousands of miles
from our shores. He said on that day (and I quote):

"The President has already asked Congress to do everything
but declare war and do everything that was ever done by
any government in any war at any time."

Not much doubt about Mr. Landon's views on our foreign
policy, is there?

And Mr. Barton, in accepting his senatorial nomination,
declared:

"The New Deal has scored its final triumph. Japan has been
driven into the arms of the Axis."

Our policy of aid to China, Mr. Barton believes, has driven
Japan into the arms of the Axis. By the same reasoning, our policy
of aid to Britain has driven the Axis into the arms of Japan? I
don't think there is much doubt as to where Mr. Barton stands on our
policy of aid to the democracies.

On September 25, last month, Senator Lodge raised his voice
too (and I quote): "I urge that our weapons be kept for our own de-
fenses."

And three days later Mr. Dewey joined the chorus, declaring
himself in these words:

"He" (meaning me) "has set himself up as the personal arbiter
of the affairs of the nations of the earth and, one by one,
he has cost us their friendship."

What are the nations whose friendship we have lost? And why
have we lost it? And what would Mr. Dewey have us go instead? Whose
friendship would be cultivated? And what would such a course mean for us and for democracy throughout the world?

But it remained for Mr. Fish to put the issue most clearly. At Philadelphia, on June 29, 1940, he declared himself as follows (and I quote):

"If we talk about 'giving aid,' we might as well endorse President Roosevelt and elect him."

I am grateful to my own Congressman for having put the issue so neatly. I am grateful for this advice he has given to the American people. I think it is sound advice.

A second major issue of the past year, debated and resolved only last month, is the question of hemisphere defense. That our defense must be a hemisphere defense is the notion, as indeed all the American republics, has recognized for over a century. If this hemisphere is breached at any point, if an aggressor gets any foothold here, the safety of every American nation is threatened, the security of every American nation is undermined.

Three months ago I requested that the Congress increase the funds of the Export-Import Bank by 500 million dollars, to assist in the building of hemisphere defense. These funds were to be used to cushion the impact of the war upon the American economies. They were to be used to expand the production of strategic materials now available chiefly from distant quarters of the globe, access to which may be cut off at any time. They were to be used to develop the resources of this hemisphere, to decrease the extent to which our
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Econeties are competitive, to increase the degree in which they are complementary. In a word, they were to be used to marshal the vast resources of the hemisphere for the defense of the hemisphere, and to prevent the use of these resources by those who have designs upon the Americas.

How did the Republican Party line up on this measure of defense? The vote is illuminating. In the Senate the Democrats voted 41 to 13 for the bill; the Republicans voted 14 to 0 against it. Mark that well—no single Republican Senator voted for the measure. In the House, the Democrats voted 212 to 7 in favor of the bill; the Republicans, 129 to 5 against it.

Let us permit Mr. Hoover to speak for the Republicans out of Congress, and Senator Taft to speak for the Republicans in Congress. At Philadelphia, on September 18, Mr. Hoover got the following dast and dismal sentiments off his chest:

"The totalitarian areas will likely embrace about 60% of the world's population and about 40% of the world's trade.

"The world is going to resume trade the moment peace comes. The idea of the free states combining against the totalitarian nations is nonsense... The interests of the free states are too divergent to consummate such combinations...."

"The idea of the free states combining against the totalitarian nations is nonsense," says Mr. Hoover. "The interests of the
free states are too divergent." And this, mind you, is one of the
men who have the gall to charge that this administration is decadent, and
that we must turn to the Republican Party for "dynamic leadership"

Now for Senator Taft. Here are pearls of wisdom indeed:

"I do not know what the Germans may do," said the Senator
pleadingly, "and no one knows what they may do until they
are freed from the present war and have an opportunity to
show. When they do, we can adopt the same methods. We
can take the same steps that may be necessary to meet the
particular kind of German "blitzkrieg", if there is such
a blitzkrieg, at the time we find out what it is."

Here is vision! Here is foresight! France waited to build
her defenses until she could discover the nature of the German blitz-
krieg, "if there was to be such a blitzkrieg." Belgium and Holland
and Norway also waited to discover what kind of blitzkrieg would be
launched. The sequel we know, but Mr. Taft counsels that we wait
until the Germans "have an opportunity to show" us too. I think it
was Poor Richard who said, "Experience is a hard teacher, but fools
will learn from no other."

But this was not the end of Mr. Taft's advice. He went on
to say (and I quote):

"The question of how we may have to meet Nazi penetration in
South American is a question which involves a thousand things,
which involves a great many measures which may have to be taken
at the time; but as far as we can see, the one thing that cer-
tainly is not going to do any good is to lend anybody any money."
There you have it again. It never fails. Let us do anything, let us do everything, for hemisphere defense, but don't spend any money! Don't even lend any money! We endorse all your measures in principle, "in principle!"

But let us continue.

"There are many things we can do," said Mr. Taft. "Our main purpose should be to do in detail every little thing—note that word—every little thing we can to help our exporters to South America to be really friendly to South America."

What boldness! That vision! Consider this statement in the light of what you yourselves know of Hitler's methods. I do not know any more perfect example of the blindness, the timidity, the helplessness in the face of danger, of the leadership of the Republican Party. Yet these are the very men who loudly proclaim that the country must turn to them for "dynamic leadership."

The last item on the record is the most significant of all. This is the issue of selective training and service. The Selective Training and Service Act is the keystone in the arch of our national defense. Without trained manpower, our equipment would be as useless as was the trained manpower of France without equipment.

The principle of this act is democratic: equal rights impose equal responsibility.

The method of the act is effective; only in this way can we swiftly secure the trained personnel to run the armaments we are swiftly building.
The timing of the act is wise: were we to wait until war comes, we would not only court disaster, we would insure it.

How did the Republican Party—this party that charges that we neglect national defense—how did its members vote on this basic issue?

First they offered an amendment to delay the operation of the act for 60 days (that is, until after the election). In the vote on this amendment, the Republicans in the House lined up 148 to 22 for delay. Well, they were for delay. What about the bill itself?

In the final vote on the bill, the Republicans in the House stood 88 to 46 against it, and in the Senate they stood 20 to 7 against it.

The people of this country, I am confident, recognize the Selective Training Act as the very keystones in the arch of our peace and our security. Do not forget that here again the Republican Party has been in opposition.

Now here are some Republican leaders, to be sure, who today profess support of this measure to muster our manpower for the defense of our peace. Some, no doubt, are sincere, but on the basis of the record I leave it to you to judge whether there are many of whom this can be said.

But there is one point on which there can be not the slightest doubt of their sincerity. And this is the point which brings out very clearly the fundamental difference in attitude between
the two parties. When the so-called "draft industry" amendment was passed in the Senate, a cry of anguish instinctively went up in certain Republican quarters, a yelp such as is always heard from some people when their pocketbook nerve is touched.

Now this amendment is by no stretch of the imagination a draft of capital, as everyone in the country is fully aware. It merely gives the government the power to require any recalcitrant or greedy firm to make its proper contribution to the national defense. But the reaction of the Republican leaders was a dead give away. It leaves no room for doubt as to their solicitude for property, even when the national defense is at stake. To be sure, upon collecting their wits, they found that they had "misspoken" themselves, and they now strongly endorse this amendment—"in principle". Are you taken in by this quick conversion?

The record of the Republican Party on defense and the attitude which that record displays are the stuff of which appeasement is made. I make that charge soberly and I invite the American people to consider it soberly.

I do not mean that the Republican Party favors the aggressor; I emphatically disclaim any such charge. I do not question the patriotism of the Republican Party. I do not believe that they would consciously weaken this country in the face of peril. But I do mean — and I cannot too greatly emphasize this — I do mean that their attitudes of mind in facing international, as in facing domestic crises, would inevitably bring this country, were they in position of national leadership, to appeasement.
In facing the internal crisis of 1929-32, they permitted
the depression to snowball, when a few early and vigorous moves could
have halted it. They were timid, when boldness was essential. They
were short-sighted, when vision was called for. They put their re-
liance in faith, instead of marshalling the full strength of the
Nation for recovery. In a word, they sought to appease the depression.

Today, in the face of international crisis, the record is
crystal clear. They are again short-sighted, when vision is neces-
sary. They are again timid, when courage is required. Their wills
are again paralysed, when we must be resolute.

I wish to say, with all the emphasis of which I am capable,
that the leadership of the Republican Party, if elected, would be weak,
timid, short-sighted, compliant. This is the stuff of which appease-
ment is made.

It is the stuff of which appeasement was made in France and
in Britain. There, too, the promise was "peace in our time", but the
measures which would have guaranteed that peace were not taken; the
total defense which could have made their security absolute was not
built. They, too, were timid, when they should have been bold. They
too were short-sighted, when vision was vital. They too put a price
upon the defense of their liberty, which should have been above price.
They too sought peace by hiding under their beds.

Step by step, theirs was a record which is matched in this
country by the record of the leadership of the Republican Party.
There is a deadly parallel in the words; there is an even deadlier
parallel in the performance. But there are many people who, knowing this record of the leadership of the Republican Party, place their hope in the candidate of that party, who, as you may remember has only recently joined the fold. This hope is a mirage. Not even Knute Rockne could forge an effective, hard-hitting, forward moving team out of that miscellaneous assortment of scrub material. And the Republican candidate, as you may have gathered before this, is no Knute Rockne.

On the issues of defense and foreign policy, he blows hot and he blows cold, but mostly he just blows. On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, he steps right up and offers to lick Hitler with his bare hands. On Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, he denounces this administration for "inflammatory statements" and "manufactured panic".

On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, he says things like this:

"We must admit that the loss of the British fleet would greatly weaken our defense. We must send and we must keep sending aid to Britain, our first line of defense and our only remaining friend. In the Pacific, our best ends will be served by a free, strong, and democratically progressive China, and we should render China economic assistance to that end."

But on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, he cries:

"What have we done, overtly or secretly, to cause the most ruthless states in the world to make this aggressive declaration? The Axis-Rapin pact. I say we must stop right where we are ... Let us find out what our foreign policy really
is. Let us determine what it really ought to be."

And he adds:

"The loneliness of the United States is the direct result of the foreign policies of the last eight years . . . No nation on earth, except Britain, owes us anything but disillusionment and ill will."

On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, he declares that a more change in the national administration will make our defenses impenetrable. On Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, he says that our defenses are down and that it will take 12 to 22 months to equip an army of 750,000 men.

On Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, he is for a strong government in the face of the international emergency. But on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, strong government, he cries, is dictatorship.

And on Sunday he takes counsel with his research staff (which he quite properly declines to call a "braintrust") to arm himself with the contradictions—the double-talk—for the coming week.

If there is a difference between the old and the new leadership of the Republican Party, I cannot see it. The simple truth is that there is no such difference. The promises of the leadership of the Republican Party must be evaluated upon the basis of their record. That record I have not before you. Consider soberly whether this record gives us any assurance of strength, and of the peace that can only come from strength, were they elected to office.
The leadership of the Republican Party, like the leadership of the Democratic Party, hate war and would gladly give their lives to keep war from our shores. But so too did Mr. Chamberlain and so too did H. Delcisor. The issue before this Nation is not the issue of greater love of peace.

The basic issue is this: Into whose hands do you wish to place the responsibility for the building of the defenses which shall preserve the peace of this hemisphere? At a time when dictatorships, dictatorships ruthless and unorthodox, swift and deadly in their methods, are embarked upon a course of world conquest, into whose hands shall you place the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs? It is this issue that persuaded me to accept the nomination of my party for the Presidency.
Tonight I take up again the public duty - the far from
disagreeable duty - of answering major campaign falsifications with
facts.

Last week in Philadelphia I spoke of techniques of propaganda
which had been invented in Europe by dictators - methods of propaganda
which have been imported into the United States in this campaign. I
spoke of false statements about the present industrial and economic state
of the nation. I nailed the falsehood about some fanciful secret treaties,
to dry on the barn door. I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods
the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County we used to nail up the
skins of foxes and weasels and coonskins.

Tonight, in my second talk, I am going to nail up the falsifi-
cations that have to do with our relations with the rest of the world,
and with the building up of our army, navy and air defense. It is a
very dangerous thing to distort facts about such things.
Falsehood in this field gives encouragement, and almost extends invitation to aggressor nations to further their designs or their attacks upon this hemisphere. More than that, if repeated over and over again, it is apt to create a sense of fear and doubt in the minds of some of the American people. That, as we know, is the chief kind of dictator propaganda that they have used on their intended victims before they strike.

I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators, day after day and night after night, that the rearming of America was slow and inefficient, that it is being hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad. They seem more interested in votes than in national security.

That particular type of falsehood was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years in my service as President, the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense. I could always count on their opposition to every proposal made to improve our defense.
And now today these same prophets - these men of great vision - have suddenly been awakened to the truth, the truth that they have been hearing from the Secretary of State and from me for seven years. They have suddenly discovered that there is a war on in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, they are charging that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

But, unlike them, the printed pages of the Congressional Record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. There you will find the record of their speeches and their votes. I make this assertion - that if the Republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven years, no important measure for our defense would now be law, and the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in the deplorable condition in which I found them in 1953.

I make these charges against the responsible political leadership of the Republican Party. You know that the same group, or most of them, would still control their party policy in Congress if a Republican President were elected.
Many patriotic Republicans, such as the two who are now
members of my Cabinet, Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of the
Navy Knox, have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of
this Administration to arm itself adequately for defense.

To Washington in the past few months have come not two or
three or a dozen, but several hundred of the best business executives
in the United States — Republicans and Democrats alike. Not holding
company lawyers or executives, but men experienced in actual production
— production of all the machines and tools and steel that have made
this country the industrial leader of the world. Literally all whom
I asked dropped their work and came to Washington.

I asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Harriman and
Mr. Budd because I believe they are the ablest men in the country in
their own fields. I don't know about their politics. I don't care
about their politics. All I need to know is that they're cooperating
with this Administration in our efforts for National Defense. And this
Government is cooperating with them — one hundred percent.
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All of these men - all of American industry and American labor - are doing magnificent and unselfish work. The progress to date proves it. I shall have occasion in a later speech to tell you a lot more about what they're doing.

When the first World War ended we were one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as 1933 the storm was gathering in Europe and in Asia. Year by year I reported by annual message and by special message the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. I was called an alarmist by the Republican leadership.

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations. I got them from a Congress that was Democratic. In addition to direct Congressional appropriations for the Army and Navy, I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense work from relief funds, from C.C.C. funds and from Public Works funds.
Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength. Ship for ship, and man for man, it is as powerful and efficient as any that ever sailed the seas in the history of the world. Our Army and our air forces are now at the highest level they have ever been in peacetime.

While this great, constructive work has been going forward, the Republican leaders were trying on every occasion to weaken or to block our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts, but they stated time and again through the years that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency. But I knew otherwise, and I told them so time and again through the years.

I propose to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths with what they said in the days before this election year about our armed defenses.

Listen to this statement for instance. I quote:

"The facts are that we have the largest and most powerful Navy we ever had, except for two years after the World War, and the greatest air force we ever had, and a match for any nation."
Now who do you think made this statement? It was not I.
It was not even a member of this Administration. It was the ranking
Republican member of the House Committee on Military Affairs,
Representative Hamilton Fish. He made that glowing statement in
June, 1938.

And now listen to Senator Vandenberg, also speaking in 1938.
He said that our defense expenditures had bought us (and I quote)
"an incomparably efficient Navy".

That was in 1938 before there was any thought of this
election.

And now listen to Ex-President Hoover speaking in that
same year of 1938. I quote:

"We shall be expanding 200 million dollars more than
any nation on earth," he said. "We are leading the
arms race."

And now listen to Mr. Landon, at that time the head of the
Republican Party, speaking in 1939, after the outbreak of the war
in Europe. I quote:

"We are in a better position to defend ourselves against
a foreign foe than we have ever been in the past."
And now listen to Senator Taft - up this year for the Republican Presidential nomination. As recently as February 1940, he said, and I quote:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense."

Here is the record; here is the crystal clear record. Until the present campaign opened, until there was a partisan advantage to be gained by the charge of unpreparedness, every Republican leader, in Congress and out, shouted from the housetops that our defenses were fully adequate.

Today they complain that this administration has starved our armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, our Army puny, our air forces pitifully weak. This is a remarkable somersault. I wonder if the election could have something to do with it.

If the Republican leaders were telling the truth in 1938 and 1939, then they stand convicted - out of their own mouths - convicted of falsehood today. If they are telling the truth today, they then stand convicted again out of their own mouths of falsehood, in 1938 and 1939.
The simple truth is that the Republican Party played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. They are playing politics with national security today.

How do you think the Republican leaders came to make these statements in 1938 and 1939?

What was the occasion for these vehement statements that our defenses were fully adequate to any and all emergencies?

The answer must be painfully embarrassing to the Republicans today, for in the answer lies their record of obstruction, their record of sabotage of this administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger upon the horizon.

The occasion for these statements was in each case some proposal of this administration to increase the Navy, the Army, or the air forces. When there was a concrete opportunity to vote for additional defense, the leaders of the Republican Party, without exception, declared that our defenses were entirely adequate and that I, in requesting further appropriations, was an alarmist.

Deeply concerned over what was happening in Europe, with the implications of what probably would happen, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion of 20%—forty-six additional
ships and nine hundred and fifty now plans.

What did the Republican leaders do with this chance to increase our national defense? You would think from their present barrage of verbal pyrotechnics, that they would have helped to pass that bill, or that they might even have demanded a larger expansion of the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for votes then. In those days they were trying to build up a different kind of political fence. In those days they were interested in building up a claim of economy. In those days they thought that the way to win votes was by representing this Administration as extravagant in building up national defense, indeed as hysterical and as manufacturing panics and foreign dangers which did not exist.

But now, in the serious days of 1940, that argument would be pretty dangerous to submit to the American people.

So today they have done their famous back-flop. But they cannot blot out the printed facts which have been set in cold type in the record.

They may swing through the air on the radio with the greatest of ease but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapeze performer.
The plain fact is that when the naval expansion bill was submitted to the Congress the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary. There were Senator Vandenberg and Senator Nye and the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Hamilton Fish.

And these leaders certainly were in control of their party in the Congress and they are still in control of their party in Congress. They got the kind of votes they wanted. Listen to this:

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battleships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted 67 to 20 against building them and in the Senate the Republicans voted 7 to 4 against building them. The record is clear that back in 1933 the Republican leaders were sure that we needed no more battleships. That naval expansion bill passed but it passed because of Democratic votes in the Congress and in spite of Republican opposition.

Just listen to what Senator Vandenberg had to say in the debate on that bill. I quote: "I rise in opposition to this super-super-Navy bill. I do not believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national necessity."
I can go on and cite many other examples relating to many other defense bills — not only in 1938, but in 1939.

In March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for $102,000,000 to buy certain strategic materials which we did not have in the United States.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing Army appropriations for the Air Corps.

Now that proves this simple fact and no amount of falsification in a political campaign two and a half years later will ever wipe it out. It proves that if the Republican leaders were in control of the United States Government in January, 1939, this bill to increase our Navy and our air force would have been defeated overwhelmingly. Yet those same Republican leaders dare to try to deceive the American people now into believing that they were the friends of strong defense. They do not tell the American people the plain truth — that they blocked and fought and stood in the way of strong defense.
I say that the Republican leaders played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. They are playing politics with our national security today.

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are all now yelling "as too" on help to Britain. They are doing it now because it is politically expedient. But when they had a chance last Fall to give aid to Britain, they turned it down cold.

This chance case when they voted on my recommendation to repeal the embargo on arms and munitions to belligerent nations (on the "cash and carry basis"). I made this recommendation because it was clear that our embargo law helped aggressors and harmed the victims of aggression. It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions of all kinds to Great Britain. How did the Republicans vote on the repeal of this embargo? This will be uncomfortable listening for some of them.

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six against this law under which we are now giving aid to Britain. In the House the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to nineteen against such aid.
The Act was passed by Democratic votes but it was over the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name a few, the following Republican leaders voted against the Act -- Senators McNary, Lodge, Vandenberg and Johnson; Congressman Martin, Barton and Fish.

And Congressman Martin, as you know, is the man in charge of the Republican National Campaign, and the man who would be Speaker of the House if they obtained control.

Oh it is so easy now when they know how the American people feel about aid to Britain in their great struggle to save Democracy in Europe and to protect us from attack, for those Republican leaders to rush on to the bandwagon of help and more help to Britain.

But it was only a year ago that they spoke more eloquently by their votes than they now speak even in their campaign speeches. If they had had their way a year ago, Great Britain would never have received an ounce of help from us.

Let us come down to one more example -- which took place just two months ago.

In the Senate there was a bill pending to permit the United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporation. It permitted the Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manufacturing plant which refused to
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... cooperate in national defense. The Republican Senators voted against this so-called Russell-Coverton Amendment on August 20, 1940, eight to six.

The vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would happen if the national government were turned over to their control. Their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights ahead of human lives.

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans, will never stand for that.

The bill was adopted all right by Democratic votes; but only over the bitter opposition of the Republican leaders.

Outside the walls of Congress eminent candidates began to turn new somersaults. At first they denounced the bill. Then when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their old trumps with the greatest of ease and reversed themselves in mid-air.

I have cited the record of Republican leadership of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness in international and military affairs between 1933 and 1940.
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It is the same record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when this Government was under their control between 1929 and 1933.

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness which governed the policy of the reactionary governments in France and England immediately before the war.

That fact was discovered too late in France.

Thank God, from the point of view of American democracy, it was discovered in time in Great Britain.

Please God, that spirit may never prevail in our land.

For eight years our main concern has been to look for peace and the preservation of peace.

In 1935 your Government, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, undertook to eliminate the hazards which had led to international trouble and war in the past. We led the nation in a wholly new policy. By the Neutrality Act of 1935, we made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war.

We made it clear that American investors, putting their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American war ships or soldiers to bail out their investments.
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We made it clear that we would not send American armed forces into the sovereign Republic to the south of us.

We made it clear that we would not lend our money to countries at war, lest that act would provide an excuse for us to get into war.

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones.

In these ways, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid entanglement through some episode beyond our borders.

These were measures to keep us at peace. They have been successful. And through the years of wars since 1935, there has been no episode.

In July, 1937, Japan invaded China, commencing a disastrous war which is not yet ended. On January 2, 1939, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation. It was clear that rearmament was now the only guarantee of peace. I asked for large additions to American defenses. I was called an alarmist and worse names than that.

In April, 1938, a horrified world saw German troops march into Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis -- German, French
and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher nor more enduring quality than peace by the sword."

The danger that threatened the American hemisphere was increased. Three months later, at Lima, the twenty-one American Republics solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us.

The declaration at Lima met with the cry of the Republican Party that it was an "entangling alliance". They failed to realize that if the nations on the east coast of South America were to fall into the control of a European coalition, it would inevitably prove to be an entering wedge of a European conqueror into the Republics of the West Indies, the Republics of Central America, and our immediate neighbor on the south, the Republic of Mexico. Unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe. The declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace.

Matters grew steadily worse in Europe. Czecho-Slovakia was overrun by the Nazis. General war seemed inevitable. Yet at that very moment Republican senators chanted, "There will be no war."
War came on the first of September, 1939.

The steps which we had carefully planned were put into effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.

Unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval. The American Republic set up at Panama a system of patrolling the waters of the whole western hemisphere.

With the actual fact of a general European war, we were ready for the maintenance of our own peace.

Throughout all this tragic period of brutal war and spreading hatred — we have steadfastly sought to keep mobilized the greatest active force for peace in the world — religion — belief in God.

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. In our churches we are keeping alive the highest ideals of humanity, against the time when their human spiritual values will be most needed. Without these spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace.

The ideal is well expressed in a letter to me from His Holiness the Pope at Christmas time last year. He said: "We have been deeply
moved by the noble thought contained in your note in which the
spirit of Christmas and the desire to see it applied to the great
human problems have found such eloquent expression • • • And now
that in this hour of world-wide pain and misgiving the Chief Magistrate
of the great North American Federation, under the spell of the Holy
Night of Christmas, should have taken such a prominent place in the
vanguard of those who would promote peace and generously succor
the victims of the war, bespeaks a providential help, which we
acknowledge with grateful joy and increased confidence".
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SPOLCE OF THE PRESIDENT

MADISON SQUARE GARDEN

OCTOBER 26, 194C

Tonight I take up again the public duty - the far from disagreeable duty - of answering major campaign falsifications with facts.

Last week in Philadelphia I spoke of methods of propaganda which have been imported into the United States in this campaign. I spoke of false statements being made by Republican leaders about the present industrial and economic state of the nation. I nailed the falsehood about some fanciful secret treaties, to dry on the barn door. I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County, we used to nail up the skins of foxes and weasels.

Tonight I am going to nail up the falsifications that have to do with our relations with the rest of the world, and with the building up of our army, navy and air defense. It is a very dangerous thing to distort facts about such things. Falsehood in this field gives encouragement, and almost extends invitation, to aggressor nations to further their designs or their attacks upon this hemisphere. If repeated over and over again, it is also apt to create a sense of fear and doubt in the minds of some of the American people.
I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators, day after day and night after night, that the rearming of America was slow, that it is hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad. I charge that when they repeat such falsehoods, they show that they are more interested in votes than in national security.

That particular falsehood was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense.

And now today these men of great vision have suddenly discovered that there is a war on in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, always with their eye on the good old ballot box, they are charging that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

But, unlike then, the printed pages of the Congressional Record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. There you will find the record of their speeches and their votes. And based on that record, I make this assertion — that if the Republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven
years, the important measures for our defense would not now be law;
and that the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in the
deplorable condition in which I found them in 1933.

I make these charges against the responsible political leader-
ship of the Republican Party. You know that the same group will still
control their party policy in the Congress, and outside of the Congress
whether they be the minority or the majority party.

There are millions of patriotic Republicans who have at all times
been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself
adequately for defense.

To Washington in the past few months have come not two or three
or a dozen, but several hundred of the best business executives in the
United States -- Republicans and Democrats alike. Not holding company
lawyers or executives, but men experienced in actual production --
production of all the types of machines and tools and steel that have
made this country the industrial leader of the world.

I asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Harriman and
Mr. Budd and the others because I believe they are the ablest men in the
country in their own fields. I do not know their politics. I do not
care about their politics. All I know is that they are cooperating
with this Administration in our efforts for national defense. And this
Government is cooperating with them — one hundred percent.

All of these men — all of American industry and American labor —
are doing magnificent and unselfish work. The progress to day proves it.

I shall have occasion in a later speech to tell more about the
work they are doing; and about the progress which has been made.

When the first World War ended we were one of the strongest naval
and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came
into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as 1933 the storm was gathering in Europe and in Asia.
Year by year I reported the warnings of danger from our listening posts
in foreign lands. But I was only called "an alarmist" by the Republican
leadership.

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations.
There were direct Congressional appropriations for the Army and Navy.
In addition, I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense
work from relief funds, from CCC funds and from Public Works funds,
and was understood by the Congress when the funds were voted.

Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength.
Ship for ship, and man for man, it is as powerful and efficient as any that ever sailed the seas in the history of the world. Our Army and our air forces are now at the highest level they have ever been in peacetime.

While this great, constructive work was going forward, the Republican leaders were trying to block our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts; but they stated time and again through the years that they were unnecessary and extravagant, that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency. But I knew otherwise, and, time and again through the years, I told them so.

I propose now to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths - these leaders who now disparage our defenses - indict them with what they themselves said in the days before this election year, about how adequate our defenses already were.

Listen to this statement for instance. I quote:

"The facts are that we have the largest and most powerful Navy we have ever had, except for two years after the World War, and the greatest air forces we ever had and a match for any nation."

Now who do you think made this statement in June 1938? It
as not I. It was not even a member of this Administration. It was the
ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Military Affairs,
Republican leader, Hamilton Fish.

And now listen to Republican Leader, Mr. Landen, at that time
the head of the Republican Party, speaking in 1939, after the outbreak
of the war in Europe. I quote:

"we are in better position to defend ourselves against
a foreign foe than we have ever been in the past."

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Vandenberg, also
speaking in 1938. He said that our defense expenditures had already
bought us (and I quote) "an incomparably efficient Navy"; and he said
further "I rise in opposition to this super-super Navy bill. I do not
believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national
necessity".

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Taft - the runner-up
this year for the Republican Presidential nomination - speaking in
February 1940. I quote:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tre-
mandous appropriations of the current year seems to
be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with

defense."

There is the record; there is the crystal clear record. Until
the present political campaign opened, Republican leaders, in Congress
and out, shouted from the housetops that our defenses were fully
adequate.

Today they complain that this administration has starved our
armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, our Army puny, our air forces
piteously weak.

This is a remarkable somersault.

I wonder if the election could have something to do with it.

The simple truth is that the Republican Party played politics
with defense in 1938 and 1939. They are playing politics with national
security today.

It is the Congress which passes the laws of the United States —
not the President. I know from long experience that there must be team
work between the Executive and the Congress. The record of these
Republican leaders shows what a slim chance the cause of strong defense
would have, if they were in control.

Not only in their statements but in their votes is written
their record of sabotage of this administration's continual efforts
to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger
upon the horizon.

For example, deeply concerned over what was happening in
Europe, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion
of 20% - forty-six additional ships and nine hundred and fifty new
planes.

What did the Republican leaders do when they had this chance
to increase our national defense almost three years ago? You would
think from their present barrage of verbal pyrotechnics, that they
rushed in to pass that bill, or that they even demanded a larger
expansion of the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for
votes then.

In those days, they were trying to build up a different kind of
political fence.

In those days, they were interested in building up a spacious
claim of economy.

In those days, they thought that the way to win votes was by
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representing this Administration as extravagant in national defense,
indeed as hysterical and as manufacturing panics and foreign dangers
which did not exist.

But now, in the serious days of 1940, all is changed! Not
only because they are serious days; but because they are election
days as well.

Today they have done a spectacular back-flop. But they cannot
blot out the printed facts in cold type in the record.

On the radio they swing through the air with the greatest of
ease; but the American people are not voting this year for the best
trapeze performer.

The plain fact is that when the naval expansion bill was sub-
mitted to the Congress the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate
for Vice President, Senator McNary. There were Senator Vandenberg and
Senator Nye. There was the man who would be the Chairman of the
House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congresswoman Fialh.

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battle-
ships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted 67 to 20
against building them; and in the Senate the Republicans voted 7 to 4 against building them.

The record is certainly clear that back in 1938 the Republican leaders were positive that we needed no more battleships. The naval expansion bill was passed; but it was passed because of Democratic votes in the Congress. It was passed in spite of Republican opposition.

I can go on and cite many other examples relating to many other defense bills.

In March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for $102,000,000 to buy certain strategic defense materials which we did not have in the United States.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing appropriations for the Army Air Corps.

Now that proves this simple fact and no amount of falsification in a political campaign two and a half years later will ever wipe it out. It proves that if the Republican leaders were in control
of the United States Government in 1938 and 1939, these measures to increase our Navy and our air forces would have been defeated overwhelmingly.

I say that the Republican leaders played politics with defense in 1938 and 1939. I say that they are playing politics with our national security today.

One more example:

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are all now yelling "me too" on help to Britain. But last Fall they had a chance to vote to give aid to Britain - and they turned it down.

This chance came on the Congressional vote on my recommendation to repeal the embargo on the shipment of armaments and munitions to belligerent nations and to permit such shipment on a "cash-and-carry basis". I made this recommendation because it was clear that our embargo law was in some cases helping aggressors and injuring the victims of aggression. It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions of all kinds to Great Britain.
How did the Republicans vote on the repeal of this embargo?

This will be uncomfortable listening for some of them.

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six against it. In the House the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to nineteen against it.

The Act was passed by Democratic votes but it was over the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name a few, the following Republican leaders voted against the Act — Senators McNary, Vandenberg, Hye, and Johnson; Congressmen Martin, Barton and Fish.

Oh it is so easy now when they know how the American people feel about aid to Britain in their great struggle to save democracy in Europe, for these Republican leaders to rush on to the bandwagon for help and more help to Britain.

At the eleventh hour, they have discovered what we know all along — that the success of Britain in warding off invasion
by dictatorship forces means the safety of those smaller nations which still retain their independence and the restoration of sovereignty to those smaller nations which have temporarily lost it. One of the keystones of American policy is the recognition of the right of small nations to survive and prosper.

It was only a year ago that they spoke more eloquently by their votes than they now speak even in their campaign speeches.

If they had had their way a year ago, Great Britain would never have received an ounce of help from us.

Let us come down to one more example — which took place just two months ago.

In the Senate there was an amendment to permit the United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporation in defense work. It permitted the Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manufacturing plant which refused to cooperate in national defense.

The Republican Senators voted against this Russell-O'Verton Amendment on August 20, 1940, eight to six.

The bill was adopted all right by Democratic votes.

But the vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would
happen if the national government were turned over to their
control. Their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights
ahead of human lives.

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans,
will never stand for that.

Outside the walls of Congress eminent candidates began
to turn new somersaults. At first they denounced the bill. Then
when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their
trapeze with the greatest of ease, and reversed themselves in
mid-air.

I have cited this record of Republican leadership of
timidity, weakness and short-sightedness in international and
military affairs between 1933 and 1940.

It is the same record of timidity, weakness and short-
sightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when this
Government was under their control between 1929 and 1933.

The Republican leaders' memories seem to have been short,
in this, as in other matters. And by the way — who was it said
that an elephant never forgets?
It is the same record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness which governed the policy of the reactionary governments in France and England immediately before the war.

That fact was discovered too late in France.

From the point of view of American democracy, it was discovered in time in Great Britain.

Please God, may that spirit never prevail in our land.

For eight years our main concern has been to look for peace and the preservation of peace.

In 1935 your Government, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, undertook to eliminate the hazards which had led to international trouble and war in the past.

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and other steps:

We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war.

We made it clear that American investors, who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments.

We made it clear that we would not send American armed forces into the sovereign Republics to the south of us.
We made it clear that we would not lend our money to countries at war, lest that act would provide an excuse for war.

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones.

In all these ways, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid entanglement through some episode beyond our borders.

These were measures to keep us at peace. They have been successful. For through all the years of wars since 1935, there has been no episode.

In July, 1937, Japan invaded China, commencing a disastrous war which is not yet ended.

On January 3, 1938, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the world situation.

It was clear that rearmament was now the only guarantee of peace. I asked for large additions to American defenses. I was called an alarmist—and worse names than that.

In April, 1938, a horrified world saw German troops march into
Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis -- German, French and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was only an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher nor more enduring quality than peace by the sword".

Three months later, at Lima, the twenty-one American Republics solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us.

Unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe. The declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace.

Matters grew steadily worse in Europe. Czecho-Slovakia was overrun by the Nazis. General war seemed inevitable. Yet even then Republican Senators kept chanting, "There will be no war".

War came on the first of September, 1939.

The steps which we had carefully planned were put into effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.
Unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval.

The American Republics set up in Panama a system of patrolling the waters of the whole western hemisphere.

Are you going to trust your future and the lives of your children to this type of affirmative, realistic fight for peace. Or would you rather turn them over to the inexperienced hands of those with no record at all — to those, who in those perilous days, are willing recklessly to imply that our boys are already on their way to the transports?

Throughout all this tragic period of brutal war and spreading hatred — we have steadfastly sought to keep mobilized the greatest active force for peace in the world — religion — belief in God.

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. In our churches we are keeping alive the highest ideals of humanity, against the time when their human spiritual values will be most needed. Without those spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace.
This is the ideal so well expressed in a letter to me from His Holiness the Pope at Christmas time last year. He said: "We have been deeply moved by the thought contained in your note in which the spirit of Christmas and the desire to see it applied to the great human problems have found such eloquent expression..." And now that in this hour of world-wide pain and misgiving the Chief Magistrate of the great North American Federation, under the spell of the Holy Night of Christmas, should have taken such a prominent place in the vanguard of those who would promote peace and generously succor the victims of the war, bespeaks a providential help, which we acknowledge with grateful joy and increased confidence."

Since His Holiness wrote those words, the shadows have deepened over the faith and hope of humankind.

We - who walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light - have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes, or to the consequences, of these tragedies.
We are determined that these evil things shall not happen here.

We shall guard ourselves against all evils — spiritual as well as material — which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We shall continue to go forward in firm faith. We shall continue to go forward in peace.
SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT
MADISON SQUARE GARDEN
OCTOBER 29, 1940

You will realize, I know, my difficulty in being away from Washington in these trying days, but I am very happy tonight that I have been able to be in this great City of my home State for a few hours.

Tomorrow morning I will be back in Washington to take part in the official drawing of numbers in the national muster for American defense. By this drawing of 10% of the total names, 90% of the enrollees will be assured that they can continue in their present private and public occupations. And of the one million seven hundred thousand names which will come out of the Bowl, more than half of them will soon know that their Government does not require their active service. In other words, less than 5% of the total of the mustered man-power will be called. Over 95% will not.

Tomorrow night I leave Washington for a day's trip in New England. I will be in Washington on Thursday and a part of Friday. That night I speak in Brooklyn. On Saturday, going by way of western New York, I will speak in Cleveland. If world affairs seem critical, I will return to Washington and go up to vote in Hyde Park on
Tuesday -- God willing.

In these speeches I am seeking to develop in an orderly way what might be called reminders — reminders of facts in our recent history and reminders of deliberate misrepresentation in regard to those facts.

Last week in Philadelphia I spoke of techniques of propaganda which had been invented in Europe by dictators on their way to supreme power in their own and neighboring countries — methods of propaganda which have been imported into the United States in this campaign. I spoke of false statements about the present industrial and economic state of the nation — domestic affairs. I nailed the falsehood of secret treaties to dry on the barn door -- the way up in Dutchess County we used to nail the skins of foxes, weasels, hawks and woodpussies to the barn door when I was a boy.

Tonight, in my second talk, I am going to nail up the falsifications that have to do with our relations with the rest of the world, and more particularly with our army, navy and air defense. It is a very dangerous thing, it veers close to the edge of unpatriotic utterance, to distort facts about them. In this case falsehood gives encouragement and also extends invitation to aggressor nations to further
their designs or their attacks upon this hemisphere. More than that, it is apt to create, if repeated over and over again, an inferiority complex in the minds of the American people, and aid our enemies. That, as we know, is the main type of dictator propaganda that has been used on their intended victims before they strike.

Therefore, it is with a real sense of deep down indignation that I now brand as false the statement being made, day after day and night after night by Republican campaign orators, that the re-arming of America is slow and insufficient, that it is being hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threat from abroad. They seem more interested in votes than in national security.

Proof? Here it is. That particular type of falsehood was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years in my service as President, the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense. I could count on their opposition.
It was not until June or July of 1940, when the famous somersault took place. We hear from them today that we are placing too little emphasis on national defense.

Later this week I will give you facts and figures about munitions of all kinds. Tonight I lead up to that. The pages of the Congressional Record itself will show you the credentials of the Republican leaders, who, in Congress and in the press and over the radio of the nation, opposed the efforts of this Administration, time and again, to strengthen the defenses of America. I make this assertion — that if the Republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the United States, no important measure for our defense would now be law, and the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in the deplorable condition in which I found them in 1933.

I do not make these charges against all Republicans. I do so against the responsible leadership of that Party — remembering that the same group, or most of them, would still control their party policy in Congress if a Republican President were elected.

Many Republicans, such as the two who are now members of my Cabinet, Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of the
Navy Knox, have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself adequately for defense.

To Washington in the past few months have come not two or three or a dozen, but several hundred of the best business executives in the United States — Republicans and Democrats alike. Not just holding company executives, but people in charge of actual producing corporations, turning out goods by the thousand for the benefit of the people of the country. Literally all whom I asked dropped their work and came to Washington with one outstanding exception, who pleaded that his private business would keep him away.

All of these men are doing magnificent and unselfish work and if you ask them what they think about the general efficiency of this preparedness drive, they will tell you honestly and sincerely that it is amazingly high.

When the first World War ended we were one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came into office twelve years later, we were one of the weakest. But the responsibility
for that charge where it belongs. It was the party of Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover that was in control of the Government during those years.

As you well remember, as early as 1933, I reported the storm that was gathering in Europe and in Asia. Year by year I reported by annual message and by special message the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. I was called an alarmist by the Republican leadership.

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations. I got it from the Congress but the Republican leadership tried on each occasion to weaken or to block the result. In addition to Army and Navy, direct appropriations, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of improvements, were paid for by relief work, by CCC work and by Public Works money.

The ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Military Affairs furnished two years ago an example of what must be labelled sabotage — for he could not have been ignorant. He said that at that time, two and one-half years ago, that we had the greatest air force we ever had and a match for any nation.
A leading Republican Senator in April 1938, "We have an incomparably efficient Navy". You can have an incomparably efficient Navy if you have only one ship, but what he meant to convey was that our Navy at that time was wholly adequate for national defense.

In January, 1938, the only living Ex-President complained, "We are leading in the arms race". Imagine that!

In 1938, after the outbreak of the European War, the gentleman who was my opponent in 1936 — the titular head of the Republican Party — said, "We are in a better position to defend ourselves against a foreign foe than we ever have been in the past". Of course that gentleman sings a different tune today.

I could go on with such statements for the rest of the night — Republican leaders in and out of the Congress. Up to last June they were shouting from the house tops that our defenses were fully adequate. They were doing all they could to weaken or nullify every one of my efforts to further the ultimate cause of peace by making America stronger to resist any attack.
What did the Republican leaders do with this chance to increase our national defense? You would think from their present attitude of breast-beating righteousness that they would have helped to pass that bill, or that they would even have suggested a larger expansion.

But — Oh! — they were not in a national campaign for votes. They were calling this Administration extravagant, saying that we were hysterical over foreign dangers which did not exist.

Today they have done their famous backflop — but they cannot blot out the printed facts set in cold type in their record.

They may swing through the air on the radio with the greatest of ease — but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapeze performer.

When that naval expansion bill was submitted in the Congress, the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it, including the Minority Leader in the Senate, who is now the candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket.

Yes, they were in control of their Party. They got the votes they wanted.
Early in 1939, I asked for the repeal of the embargo. I asked that American be allowed to sell munitions to belligerent nations, providing they were not shipped on American ships, after payment to us in cash. The reason for that was that it was clear that under the old law aggressor nations with plenty of munitions were being, in effect, helped by forbidding munitions to the democracies that were fighting with their backs to the wall.

You remember that after many months there was a famous conference in the White House. At that conference the Secretary of State and I were told by the ranking Republicans of the Committee that his information was better than ours and that there would be no war. A filibuster appeared inevitable. Because primarily of Republican opposition, the Senate adjourned without taking action.

War broke out six weeks later. I called an extraordinary session of the Congress. My original recommendation was adopted. The heart of the United States will not be troubled by a bad conscience because since that time we have done everything possible to sustain the outposts of democracy.
Republican campaign orators and leaders are all of them
drying 'me too' on 'Help to Britain'. Most of them did so
because it is politically expedient for them to do so. But
when they had a chance in the Winter and in the Spring and in
the Summer of 1939, they were not, to put it mildly, so helpful.
I record, once more, and this will be uncomfortable listening
for some of my hearers, the vote on the passage of the Embargo
Repeal Act of 1939 was as follows: In the Senate the Republicans
voted fifteen to eight against 'Aid to Britain'. In the House
the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to twenty against
'Aid to Britain'. The Act was passed by Democratic votes.
Just to use a few of many names, the following Republicans,
among many others, voted against the Act -- Senators McNary,
Lodge, Taft, Vandenberg, and Johnson -- Congressmen Martin,
Barton and Fish.

The last item on the record is the most significant
of all. That was the issue of Selective Training and Service.
That Act, as we all know, is the keystone in the arch of our
national defense. We build and we buy billions of armament.
But without trained manpower to serve it our equipment would
be as useless as was the trained manpower of France without equipment.

The principle of the Act is Democracy.

The method of the Act is effective.

The timing of the Act is wise.

How did the Republican leadership — charging now that we neglect national defense — vote on that Bill?

Here was their chance to help the nation — their chance to show the dictator aggressors how we felt about their threats to us. The Republicans in the Senate voted against the Act, 10 to 7. The Republicans in the House voted against the Act, 88 to 46.

Some people forget that the laws of the United States are passed by the Congress of the United States. A somewhat long experience proves to me that even if the majority in both Houses belongs to the same party as the President, there must be team-work in major policies between the Executive and the Congress. If the members of such a party are on record through the years against adequate defense for the United States, they will balk at changing their Congressional
views on the mere recommendation of their own President.

We still remember the events of last month. It was under the active leadership of Representative Hamilton Fish, a Republican Congressman from this State, supported by a Republican vote of 7 to 1, (140 to 22), that the Postponement Amendment to the Enrollment Bill was pushed forward.

In the Senate, on the overwhelming adoption of the Amendment to enable the Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporations by taking over any such uncooperating manufacturing plant, three Republican Senators voted for it and ten against it. Those ten were examples of what would happen if the national government were turned over to the Republicans. It is another way of saying that on their part they put money rights ahead of human lives. You and I and the overwhelming majority of Americans will never stand for that.

Outside the halls of Congress eminent candidates began to turn new somersaults. At first they said the Amendment was Socialism. Then, when an aroused public opinion seemed to
favor the Amendment, they seized their old trapeze with the
greatest of ease and reversed themselves in mid-air.

The record of Republican leadership and the attitude
which that record displays, are the stuff of which appeasement
is made. I make that charge soberly, and I invite the Ameri-
can people to consider it soberly.

I do not charge that the Republican Party favors present
world aggressors. I do not question their patriotism.
I do not believe that would consciously weaken this nation in
the face of peril. But I do mean, and I cannot too strongly
emphasize, that their attitudes of mind and their complete
lack of understanding in facing international as well as
domestic crises, would inevitably bring the United States
under such leadership, to the necessity of appeasement.

I cite the record of timidity, weakness and shortsighted-
ness when this nation was under Republican control, from 1929
to 1933. I cite the record of Republican leadership between
1933 and 1940. The leopard is not alone in retaining his
spots. The elephant does not change his spots either.
Weakness, timidity, shortsightedness, existed in France and in England. The discovery of that fact was made too late in France. Thank God, from the point of view of the American Democracy, it was discovered in time in Great Britain. Thank God it has been discovered in the United States before it is too late.
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One more nail in the skin on the barn door.

We are accused of looking for war. Actually we have done nothing during every day and night for nearly eight years but look for peace and the preservation of peace.

Back in 1931 when Japan, in violation of treaty obligation, invaded China, seized the Province of Manchuria and converted it into a puppet state, a great Republican Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, now patriotically serving as Secretary of War, laid down the corner-stone of our policy. From then on we have declined as a nation to recognize and accept the fruits of aggression. We have consistently and rightly believed that in the process of aggression lies the possible and the probable result of general war.

In 1934 the Italian leader occupied Ethiopia by force, and the Hitler government made clear that it would seize additional territory as soon as opportunity offered. In this case, also, we have not recognized the fruits of aggression.

In 1936 your Government, in the face of growing dangers to peace, undertook to eliminate many of the practices which had got us into international trouble and war in the past. Your Government led the nation in a wholly new policy. We
made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels that flew the flag of belligerents. We made it clear that American investors, putting their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American ships or men to bail out their investments.

We made it clear that we would not send American armed forces into the sovereign Republics to the south of us.

We made it clear that we would not lend our money to belligerents, lest that act would provide an excuse for us to get into war.

We made it clear that American flagships could not carry munitions to a belligerent.

We made it clear that American ships must stay out of war zones.

To sum up, we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation, that we would avoid entanglement because of some episode beyond our borders.

And — there has been no episode.

In July, 1937, Japan invaded China, commencing a huge war not ended. On January 3, 1939, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation,
...and I asked for large additions to American defenses. In April, 1938, a horrified world saw German troops march into Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis — German, French and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was an abortive armistice.

The danger that threatened the American hemisphere was not mitigated. Three months later, at Lima, the twenty-one American Republics solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us. We were met with the Republican cry that it was an entangling alliance, but they failed to realize that if the nations on the east coast of South America were to fall into the control of a European coalition, it would inevitably prove to be an entering wedge into European control of the Republics of the West Indies, the Republics of Central America, and our immediate neighbor on the south, the Republic of Mexico.

Further requests for armament appropriations were met with a storm of abuse from the Republican leaders.
I was called an "alarmist" — and worse names than that.

Matters grew steadily worse in Europe. Under former American leadership any one of the events could have dragged us into the fray by force of arms. Czecho Slovakia was overrun by the Nazis. Albania was seized by the Italian leader. General war looked practically certain. That was the moment that Republicans chanted, "There will be no war."

It came on the first of September, 1939. The various steps which had been carefully planned were put into effect. American ships were kept from carefully drawn danger zones. American citizens were aided in coming home. American planning averted a financial panic. The American Nations approved at Panama a patrol zone which has with extraordinary success kept practically the whole hemisphere free from fighting, with a very few exceptions, like the incident of the Graf Spee.

During the years from March, 1933, to September, 1940, your Government had so successfully thought and planned ahead
that when the actual fact of a general European war
occurred we were ready for the maintenance of our own peace
in that war. As early as September 3, 1939, I said this
to the American people: "Let no man or woman thoughtlessly
or falsely talk of America sending its armies to European
fields".

"As long as I remain within my power to prevent
there will be no black-out of peace in the United States."

Nearly a year and two months have gone by since then.
That statement is as valid and as truthful today as it was
then — the simplest answer to those who opposed armament,
who called me an alarmist, who said there would be no war
and who now say that I amheading this country into war, is
to say, "Look at your record and stick it up against mine."

In these fourteen months I have very definitely sought
two great moral objectives. The first was to keep abreast
of all possible information which would bear on world events
everywhere — to know what was going on, as far as that
was humanly possible. This is being consistently carried
out, and I do not hesitate to say that our knowledge of what
happens from day to day, taking the world as a whole, is
probably greater in Washington than in any other Capital.
The other purpose was to keep mobilized the greatest active force for peace in the world — religion — belief in God. Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the great Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish 

Those great churches are keeping alive the highest ideals of humanity, against the time when their human spiritual values will be most needed, without their opinion.

The ideal is well expressed in a letter to me from His Holiness the Pope at Christmastide last year. He said:

"We have been deeply moved by the noble thought contained in your note in which the spirit of Christmas and the desire to see it applied to the great human problems have found such eloquent expression. And now that in this hour of worldwide pain and disquiet the Chief Magistrate of the great North American Federation, under the spell of the Holy Night of Christmas, should have taken such a prominent place in the vanguard of those who would promote peace and generously succor the victims of the war, bespeaks a providential help, which we acknowledge with grateful joy and increased confidence."

We have maintained unbroken allegiance that might does not make right, and that in the long run world problems
cannot be settled by force.

We have left no stone unturned in the active search for peace and the continuation of that search.

The measures we have taken are adapted to our direct defense.

In plain English, we, unlike some other Americans, are not prepared to gamble with the national safety in the hope of catching a few votes.
PERORATION

Since His Holiness wrote those beautiful words, the shadows have deepened over the faith and hope of humankind.

We — who will walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light — we have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes or the consequences of these tragedies.

We have vowed that these evil things shall never happen here.

We shall guard ourselves against all evils — spiritual as well as material — which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We shall continue to go forward in firm faith that we may continue to go forward in peace.
SPENCER AT ELYRIA SQUARE GARDEN

Last week in Philadelphia I pointed out to the American people how the techniques of propaganda invented by dictators had been imported into this campaign. It is the technique of falsification, repeated falsification, never using a small misstatement when a really big one can be invented.

I pointed out how false have been the statements made during this campaign about the present state of the nation. I pointed out the falsehood of the claims made by Republican leaders that the national economy was prostrated. I pointed out the falsity not only by cold statistics but also by proof of the rise in the American standard of living.

These falsehoods had to do with domestic affairs. It is bad enough to have falsification about the condition of America so far as its internal economy is concerned. It creates the impression to the rest of the world that we are a weak, disunited and apprehensive people, whereas the plain fact is that we are a strong, united and confident nation, with a more stable and enduring prosperity than ever before in the last two decades.

But when falsification has to do with our relations with other nations, and more particularly with our armed military and
naval defenses, the path of falsification begins to break away from the road of patriotism itself, for in this field falsification not only strikes terror into the hearts of American citizens but gives encouragement and almost extends invitation to aggressor nations to further their attacks upon this hemisphere. And so it is with a real sense of indignation that I now brand as false the statement being made day after day, night after night, by Republican campaign orators — more interested in votes than in national security — that the rearming of America is slow and inefficient, that it is being hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet the threats from abroad.

This falsehood was invented about the time of the Republican National Convention. Up to that time the Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. The fact is for almost seven years in my service as President, I always heard it said by Republican leaders that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense. It wasn't until a political campaign got under way that I began to hear from them that I was placing too little emphasis on national defense.

Now I propose tonight to give you the facts and figures
which brand those statements for what they are, but before I do this
I want to open up to you the pages of the Congressional Record to
show you the credentials of these people who are now making this
false charge. I make the statement that those Republican leaders
on the floor of the Congress and in the press and over the radio of
the nation opposed — yes even ridiculed — the efforts of this Admin-
istration to strengthen the defense of the United States and the de-
fense of the Western Hemisphere. I make the statement now that if
the Republican leaders had been in control of the Congress of the
United States that no important measure for our own defense enacted
during the last seven years would now be law. I make the charge
that if the Republican leaders had had their way during the last
seven years, our Navy, our Army and our air force would be practically
in the same shameful condition that it was in 1935 when this Adminis-
tration came to office.

I propose to prove my statements by the record of votes in
the Congressional Record and by the speeches of Republican leaders
outside the Halls of Congress.

I want to make it clear at the outset that my charges are
levied at that small group of men who have assumed to lead the Re-
publican party during the last seven years. I know that the rank and file of the members of their party have always been as sincerely devoted to their country's defense as the members of my own party. I know that some of their leaders, such as the two Republicans who are now members of my Cabinet, Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of the Navy Knox, and some of the leading Republican industrialists who are now serving with the National Defense Commission, have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself adequately for defense.

But I charge that the political Republican leaders and the men who would be the leaders in the Halls of Congress where appropriations are made and legislation is passed, the men who would frame the policy of the new Administration if it should happen to be elected, are the very ones who time and again, when I recommended increases in our physical defense stood in the forefront of the opposition, blocking it, delaying it and even at times ridiculing it.

Of course, we all understand why they now have changed their tune. They see now a possibility of frightening the American people by these stories of weakness, the possibility of scaring the American people into voting for them on the plea that they can arm
more quickly. They do not say anything, however, about how during all the years they have been blocking and delaying and hindering every effort this Administration has made to rearm.

I know that the American people will never be frightened into turning their defense work over to these leaders who were willing to sabotage it until election time came around. I know that this shameful record of double dealing is proof of how low can sink the patriotism of some people who seek to obtain votes through fraud and misrepresentation.

When the first World War ended, we were one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. When this Administration first came to office we were one of the weakest.

Now during these thirteen years we all know who must bear the responsibility for this change. Certainly it was not my party that was in control of the executive and legislative branches of the government.

Perhaps the decade up to 1931 might be excused as belonging to an era when the world thought there was a possibility of continued peace through disarmament, but I speak of the period of 1931 when the invasion of Manchuria announced the beginning of a new epoch
in the world's history, an epoch of force and territorial aggression.

Instead of taking heed of that warning, President Hoover recommended a retrenchment program in the Army and the Navy in the autumn of 1932, for the fiscal year ending in June 1934. In other words, two years after aggression began in China, the then President of the United States recommended that we cut down the Army and the Navy.

The first thing I did as President to offset this policy, way back in 1935, was to allocate out of FWA money the sum of two hundred and thirty-eight million dollars for Naval construction.
And all through the years thereafter this Administration kept
building up and building up its armed defenses.

After the shameful state Republican leaders between 1920 and
1933 had permitted it to assume, the rebuilding could not be done over-
night. It was a long time program and we set about to do it. And mind
you we set about to do it over the resisting opposition of those who now
claim that we should have done more of it.

The Republican Administration left us 135 warships in com-
mission as of June, 1933. As of June, 1940 we had 325. In 1933 that
Navy had a personnel of 90,000 officers and men. In June, 1940 it had
a personnel of 160,000 men.

In the first fiscal year of this Administration we spent
million dollars for maintenance, repair, new construction. In 1934 we
spent million. In 1935 million. In 1936
million. In 1937 million. In 1938 million. In
1939 million. To this date we have expended a total of
million dollars. And the fact is that today we have the finest
fleet, ship for ship and man for man, which ever sailed the seas in
the history of the world.

This money came not only from direct appropriations. I alle-
ciated billions of dollars for this purpose from NRA and FPA funds, from
COO and EIA appropriations.

Now what were the Republican leaders doing during this time.

There might be some excuse for their opposition up to 1936.

But by 1936 it became quite obvious what was going to happen in Europe.

I pointed it out to them in my annual message to the Congress in 1938.

I said

Realizing as I did the need for quick defense, I urged, in
January of 1938, a naval expansion of 20%. This is what I said to the
Congress in that message.

The bill which was presented to the Congress called for 46
additional fighting ships and for 950 additional aeroplanes at a total
cost exceeding a billion dollars. Now what did the Republican leaders
do about this proposal. Here was their chance to increase our national
defense. They are now yelling the falsehood that this Administration
has neglected to do it. You would think, of course, from their present
enthusiasm and vehemence that when they had their chance almost three
years ago that they rushed in to pass it at once or indeed that they
even suggested a larger expansion. You would think from their present
attitude of breast beating righteousness that they would have criticised
me 2½ years ago for recommending only 20% and that they would have urged
me to increase it to 100%. But my friends they were not in a national
campaign for votes then. They were trying in those days to build up a
different kind of political fence. In those days they were interested
in building up a claim of economy. In those days they thought that the
way to win votes was by representing this Administration as extravagant
in building up national defense, indeed as hysterical and as manufacturing
panics and foreign dangers which did not exist. In 1940 that would be
pretty dangerous to submit to the American people. It is a very simple
thing for these leaders to do a quick back flip and handspring and now
say that we were stingy, niggardly in fact in national defense and that
we should have done much more.

They may do their handsprings. They may do their back flips.
But they cannot blot out the printed facts which have been set in cold
type in the Congressional Record.

In their own mind they may swing through the air on the radio
with the greatest of ease but the American people are not voting this year
for the best trapeze artist.

The plain fact is that when the naval expansion bill was submitted
to the Congress the Republican leaders jumped in to fight the recommendation.

Who were they. The leaders in this fight were the Republican
candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary, who would preside over the
Senate and would be influential in the Cabinet of the United States
if his candidate were elected. There was Senator Vandenberg and Senator
Eyre. There was the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee
on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Hamilton Fish.

And these leaders certainly were in control of their party
representatives in the Congress. They had no difficulty in getting the
kind of votes they wanted. Listen to this. The Republican vote in
the House of Representatives on that bill for national defense 2½ years
ago was 57 to 30 against the bill, almost 2 to 1. The Republican vote
in the Senate was 9 to 7 against the bill.

Now that proves this simple fact and no amount of falsification
in a political campaign 2½ years later will ever wipe it out. It proves
that if the Republican leaders were in control of the United States
government in January 1938 the bill to increase our Navy and our air
force would have been defeated overwhelmingly and yet those same Republican
leaders dare to try to deceive the American people now into believing that
they were the friends of strong defense instead of telling them the truth,
that they blocked and fought and stood in the way of strong defense.

And there was plenty of oratory back in 1938 to the effect
that we had a strong enough Navy and a strong enough air force and a
strong enough Army for all our needs. In January 1938, for example,
Ex-President Hoover complained about the cost of our defense as fellows.

"Our military expenditures were about seven hundred millions in 1938... We shall be expending two hundred million dollars more than any nation on earth. We are leading in the arms race..." He was not saying that with any tinge of satisfaction that this Administration was doing a good job. He was complaining that we were spending too much money. And even a year later another Presidential candidate, the titular leader, at that time, of the Republican Party, said in May, 1939 "There is no question in my mind that the command of the sea insures security in our land for my time and probably for my youngest child's time..." And in October, 1939, even after the outbreak of the present war, one of the influential Republican leaders in the Senate, a runner up in the Republican Presidential Convention last June, said "I am convinced we can defend our continent against any combination likely to develop in the rest of the world..." And even in February of this year Senator Taft declared "The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense..."
And see what Congressman Fish, the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, had to say about this Naval Expansion Bill on February 14, 1936: "I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that the proposed eight hundred million dollar additional expansion to our Navy is unnecessary for defense and inconsistent with our foreign policies of keeping out of European and Asiatic blood feuds and conflicts. The proposed new increase of eight hundred million dollars in our Navy is not essential for national defense and, in my opinion, will be used for aggression and to police and quarantine the world in accordance with the President's Chicago speech."

And on April 19, 1936, Senator Nye, high in the ranks of the Republican party, fighting the bill for naval expansion said: "My own conclusion is that we are adequately prepared to repulse any such effort even in South America on the part of a foe from across the Atlantic or across the Pacific."

And listen to what Senator Vandenberg had to say on April 21, 1936: "I rise in opposition to this super-super-Navy bill. I do not believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national necessity. I do not believe it is required by any rational estimate of an essential national defense."
This Naval Expansion Bill passed, but it passed because of Democratic votes in the Congress. The record is clear that if Republican leadership had been followed in 1932, the bill to expand the Navy would have been defeated.

The same thing happened in 1939. I again sent to the Congress a message on national defense, requesting additional appropriations for the physical defense of the country. It was directed particularly at aircraft expansion.

There was another chance for these Republican leaders, who now talk about inadequate armament, to show how much they cared for the defense of the United States. They had their chance to vote in March, 1939, on an amendment which would raise the authorized number of planes from fifty-five hundred to six thousand.
That Amendment was adopted but it wasn't by Republican votes. It was by Democratic votes. The Republicans in the Senate voted 11 to 8 against the Bill and there in the ranks of the opposition were the same leaders: there was McNary, there was Vandenberg, there was Johnson, there was Myer. In March, 1939 they again had their chance to vote for the defense of the country. There was a bill up to appropriate $102,000,000 for purchase of certain strategic material. The bill was adopted by Democratic votes. But the Republican members of the Senate voted against it 12 to 4 and one more illuminating essential. There was an amendment pending in the House of Representatives to reduce the Army appropriations by $20,000,000 from Air Corps and $13,000,000 from contract authorizations for new aeroplanes. Mind you, this was a vote which meant cutting down the strength of our Air Force. It came to a vote the day of 1939. To hear the Republican leaders talk today you would have imagined that they would have immediately have sent up a howl of protest against this amendment to cut the Air Force. Not a bit of it. They voted to cut this Air Force by a vote of 144 to 8, almost 20 to 1. The Amendment was defeated but not by the votes or efforts of those leaders who now complain of an inadequate Air Force. It was defeated because the Democrats in the House were realistic enough 2 years ago to know that we needed more planes and more planes and more planes.
Just a month ago I recommended to the Congress the authoriza-
tion of $800,000,000 to the Export-Import Bank in order to make loans
to South America and to increase the lending powers of the RFC by
$1,000,000,000.

The purpose of this was to strengthen our hemispheric defense
and to enable the other South American Republics to cooperate with us.
This was just a month ago. Even then those leaders who now falsely
charge us of weakness were not willing to permit us to build up this
hemispheric defense. The Democrats in both Houses voted to pass the
bill but how did the Republicans vote—those people who now are so
vocal in their enthusiasm for national and hemispheric defense. In
the Senate they voted 18 to 0 against it. In the House they voted
129 to 6 against it. And there were the same leaders blocking the
way, speaking by their votes more eloquently of what they really
thought and by their campaign speeches to instill fear in the
people—there was McNary, there was Taft, there was Vandenberg,
there was Lodge, there was Johnson.
As far back as 1939 I recommended that our neutrality Law
be amended so as to permit us to sell munitions and implements of war
to belligerent nations, providing they would be carried away in the
belligerents’ own ships after payment in cash. The reason for this
recommendation was that it was becoming quite obvious that our Neu-
trality Law which forbade the sale of munitions to any belligerent
was working out to help aggressors and injure the victims of aggres-
sion.

However, the bill was not defeated. When the present war
broke out in September, I again made that recommendation to the
Congress. The recommendation this time was finally adopted by the
Congress. Under the recommendation we were enabled to sell arms and
munitions to France and England. Under that revision we have been
selling planes and ships and tanks and guns and munitions of all kinds
to Great Britain. Under that revision Great Britain has been re-
ceiving and is still receiving the material help from us, without
which it never could have survived the attacks being made upon it.
The American people, realizing that the heroic people of Britain are
holding the forces of aggression at bay and keeping the war away from
our shores, want to extend to Great Britain all the material assistance
the can.

The Republican campaign leaders are all now yelling "me
too" on help to Britain. They are doing it because it is politically
helpful to them to do it. But when they had a chance last fall to
show their love for democracies and their hatred of aggressor dic-
tatorships, they were not so helpful.

They not only voted against the bill but actually led a
vigorous opposition to defeat it. There they were, the same men
who would govern the foreign affairs of this country if their can-
didate were elected, Senator McNary who seeks to be Vice-President,
Congressman Martin who would be the Speaker of the House, Congress-
man Fish who would be the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee,
Senator Johnson who is the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Af-
fairs Committee, Senators Taft and Vanderburg who nearly became the
Presidential candidates of their party, and Congressman Bruce Barton.
And outside of the Halls of Congress there were the titular heads of
the Republican party, ex-President Hoover and former candidate Landon.

They were very determined in their opposition then to the
law which has virtually saved Great Britain from destruction and they
were vigorous enough to impose their will upon the Republican mem-
bership in the House and in the Senate. In the House, the Republicans
voted 140 to 20 against the measure 7 to 1, and in the Senate they
voted 15 to 8 against the measure, almost 2 to 1.

There was a lot of eloquence by some of these Republican
leaders. For example, on October third ex-President Hoover had
this to say in a newspaper interview. I quote: "If one surveys the
whole front, sea, land, air and economic resources, I am convinced
the Allies can defend their empires. The end may be victory for
them, at worst it might be stalemate. I do not see any possibility
that they can be defeated".

On October 10, 1939, Senator Lodge said on the floor of the
Congress: "I submit that the chances of England and France being de-
feated are slim indeed ***** no European power can occupy or van-
quish the United States, and it is fanciful to suggest that it could.
Fortunately, our national safety is not at stake".

On October thirteenth, Senator Taft said on the floor of
the Congress: "I believe that fear is based on an illusion. Herbert
Hoover recently showed that Hitler is most unlikely to win, whether
or not he can be defeated. Even if he should win, he would hardly
be free to attack the United States ***** I am convinced that we can
defend this continent against any combination likely to develop in
the rest of the world."

Senator Taft on September 30, 1939, said: "I do not claim
that a world dominated by Hitler and Stalin would be a pleasant world
to live in, but terrible as conditions might be, I do not see why they
would threaten the safety of the United States. I cannot even
see why trade between the United States and the rest of the world
would not continue in about the same volume as before."
Oh it is so easy now when they knew how the American people feel about aid to Britain in their great struggle to save Democracy in Europe and to protect us from attack, for these Republican leaders to rush on to the bandwagon of help and more help to Britain, but it was only a year ago that they spoke more eloquently by their votes than they now speak in their campaign speeches. And they eloquently said a year ago, no help to Britain, let them fight their own battles, we won't even sell them materials of war for cash for them to carry away in their own ships in order to fight the forces of evil.

The American people could even pardon this somersault perhaps. But what adds insult to injury is the charge they now make that we are not furnishing enough help to Britain. If they had had their way a year ago they know and the American people know that Great Britain would never have received an ounce of help from us and that long before this they would have been crushed under the war machine which is crushing the rest of Europe.

And I wish to speak of one more most important item in our national defense in order to show you how brazen is the misstatement of these Republican campaign orators that we are failing to rearm the United States efficiently and speedily. I want to open the Congressional record to you and show you the Republican votes on the Selective Service
Act of 1940. That is the Act under which 17,000,000 young men have registered and from which will be drawn the man power without which any attempt to defend the United States would be a mockery. Everybody knows that ships and guns and tanks and planes are useless unless men are trained to operate them. And so there came before the Congress the statute under which men were to be mustered to make effective the billions of dollars which were being translated into implements of war. The vote on this measure took place only last July. What did these Republican leaders, so bold and courageous and patriotic during election time, have to say and do with respect to this measure. That was their chance to help the nation show its strength. That was their chance to show the dictator aggressors how we felt about their threats to us. How did they rise to the occasion? The Republicans in the Senate voted against the Act 10 to 7. The Republicans in the House voted against the Act 88 to 46. And there were the same Republican leaders - the same men as would form our foreign policy if their candidate were elected - Taft and Vandenberg and Johnson and Fish - leading the opposition against the bill which is the very keystone of our arch of defense.

Even more eloquent than this vote against the Selective Service Act of 1940 was the vote of the Republican leaders on a bill introduced by
Republican Congressmen, Hamilton Fish. This bill would have postponed
until after election day the taking effect of the Selective Service Act.
I make the definite charge that that bill to provide for a sixty day
delay shows the real reason why these Republican leaders voted against
the Selective Service Act itself. I make the definite charge that they
did it because they were afraid that if they voted for the Act they would
lose votes in the election. I make the charge that they put politics
above patriotism. And when they saw that the Democratic members of the
Congress were determined to cement our defenses by the muster of men,
they again showed their political cowardice by seeking to delay the Act
itself.

They little understood the temper of the American people.
They little understand it today. But they were taking no chances. They
thought it might be well to wait until after election day. They did
not understand that the American people mean business, that the American
people are throwing every ounce of their energy into this effort to
defend themselves, that the American people are forthright and direct
in their attitude towards aggressor nations and that such subterfuges as
sixty day delays would be brushed aside by them. I charge that nothing
would have given greater comfort to aggressor nations than a bill to delay
our Selective Service Act for sixty days. It would have been notice to
the world that we were hesitant in our defense, that we were weak and
decadent. That we really didn't mean what we said when we announced our determination to defend the Western Hemisphere.

How did these Republican leaders, who now claim we have delayed defense, vote on this bill for sixty day delay. In the House of Representatives the Republicans voted 140 against 22 for delay, 7 to 1. If these leaders had been in control of the Congress the law under which the man power of the nation is now being mustered, would never have been adopted.

And there was another eloquent demonstration of what the Republican leaders thought about our muster of all the resources of the nation.

There was an amendment introduced to the Selective Service Act which would authorize the United States Government, on paying a just and adequate compensation, to take over any manufacturing plant which refused to cooperate with its Government. The purpose of this amendment was clear. It was to enable the Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporation which was unwilling to have its plant cooperate in the national defense or which sought to drive extortionable and unconsolable bargains with its Government. This Administration believed that so long as we were calling upon the young men of the nation for service, the Government of the United States should
have a right to call upon industry to cooperate with its Government.

That would seem to be common sense. That would seem to be essential
for national defense. The amendment was adopted alright, but not because
the Republican leaders helped. The Congressional Record shows that
only three Republican leaders voted for it and that ten voted against
it. Outside the Halls of Congress some of the candidates began to de
somersaults. At first they said the amendment was socialism. Then
when public opinion seemed to favor the amendment they took up their
position on their own trapeze and, with the greatest of ease, began to
yell for the passage of the amendment. Not so the Republican Congres-
sional leaders. They stood firm and if they had had their way the
amendment would have been defeated.

Now what does the record of all these congressional facts
mean to us. They mean that the Republican leadership of this nation,
at a time when votes are not in the balance, stood firm against efforts
to aro and defend this nation and this hemisphere from attack. It means
that the American people can place no reliance upon their brave presta-
tions nor of how strong they want to make America. It means that the
Republican leadership of the nation would if they could sabotage all
that we have done to build up our defenses and to make ourselves strong.

The simple truth is that the record of the Republican Party
has been a consistent record of obstruction of national defense. They
played politics with defense in 1936 and 1939. They are playing politics with our defense today. I leave this simple question to you. Where would our defenses be today if those Republican leaders had been in office during these past eight years?